

**STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY**

**SITE VISIT MARCH 15-17, 1993**

**NEVADA STATE REPORT**

**OCTOBER 20, 1993**

**FINAL**

**Prepared for:**

**Martha A. Mayes, Project Officer  
Office of Analysis and Evaluation  
Food and Nutrition Service  
3101 Park Center Drive  
Alexandria, VA 22302**

**FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007**

**THE ORKAND CORPORATION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation .....	3
2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs .....	3
2.3 FSP Administrative Costs .....	4
2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance .....	4
2.4.1 Staffing .....	4
2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change .....	4
2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate .....	5
2.4.4 Claims Collection .....	5
2.4.5 Certification/Reviews .....	5
<b>3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE CURRENT SYSTEM .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Current System Functionality .....	6
3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity .....	7
3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio .....	7
3.4 Current Automation Issues .....	7
<b>4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT IMPLEMENTATION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1 Overview of the Previous System .....	8
4.2 Justification for the New System .....	8
4.3 Planning and Development Activities .....	8

4.4	Conversion Approach .....	9
4.5	Project Management .....	9
4.6	FSP Participation .....	9
4.7	MIS Participation .....	10
4.8	Problems Encountered During Planning .....	10
<b>5.0</b>	<b>TRANSFERABILITY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
6.1	System Profile .....	11
6.2	Description of Operating Environment .....	12
6.2.1	Operating Environment .....	12
6.2.2	State Operations and Maintenance .....	12
6.2.3	Telecommunications .....	12
6.2.4	System Performance .....	13
6.2.5	System Response .....	13
6.2.6	System Downtime .....	13
6.2.7	Current Activities and Future Plans .....	13
<b>7.0</b>	<b>COST AND COST ALLOCATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
7.1	Nevada FAMIS Development Costs and Federal Funding .....	14
7.1.1	Nevada FAMIS System Components .....	16
7.1.2	Major Nevada Planning Cost Components .....	16
7.1.2.1	NOMADS Planning Costs .....	16
7.1.2.2	Hardware and Software .....	16
7.1.2.3	Contractor Costs .....	17

7.1.2.4 State Personnel Costs .....	17
7.2 Nevada Operational Costs .....	18
7.2.1 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures .....	18
7.3 Nevada Cost Allocation Methodologies .....	19
7.3.1 Overview of NOMADS Development Cost Allocation Methodology .....	19
7.3.2 Nevada Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics .....	20

## APPENDICES

A State of Nevada Exhibits .....	A-1
B Operator User Satisfaction Survey .....	B-1
C Managerial User Satisfaction Survey .....	C-1

## LIST OF TABLES

### Table No.

2.1	Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation .....	3
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued .....	4
2.3	FSP Federal Administrative Costs .....	4
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate .....	5
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected .....	5
7.1	Current NOMADS Budget .....	15
7.2	Projected State Personnel Costs .....	17
7.3	Current Food Stamp System Operating Costs .....	18
7.4	NOMADS Allocation Percentages .....	19

## APPENDIX A - State of Nevada Exhibits

### Exhibit #

2-1	Response to Regulatory Changes .....	A-2
6-1	Hardware Inventory for Nevada .....	A-4
7-1	NOMADS Budget FY93 - FY95 .....	A-5

**NEVADA STATE REPORT**  
**Site Visit March 15, 1993**

**STATE PROFILE**

**System Name:** Nevada Operations of Multi-Automated Data Systems (NOMADS)

**Start Date:** 1990

**Completion Date:** 1995 (est.)

**Contractor:** ISSC

**Transfer From:** Rhode Island (InRhodes)

**Cost:**

**Actual:** Not completed

**Projected:** \$22,623,574

**FNS Share:** \$ 5,983,554

**FNS %:** 26.45%

**Number of Users:** 627

**Basic Architecture:**

**Mainframe:** IBM ES9000 - 500

**Workstations:** 3270-type terminals

**Telecommunications:** Food Stamps use a subset of 100 - SNA

**Network** 9.6 KB lines directly linked to the Carson City data center and a portion of a T1 link to Las Vegas

**System Profile:**

**Programs:** Current Food Stamp system is a standalone application. NOMADS will be an integrated Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, Child Support Enforcement, Child Care, JOBS and Training system.

## **1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT**

The Nevada State Welfare Division's Program and Field Operations Unit consists of three sections:

- Eligibility and Payments
- Benefits and Support Program
- Field Offices

The Eligibility and Payments Section is the organization responsible for the administration and operation of the Food Stamp Program in Nevada, conducted through fourteen (14) local offices. The Department of Information Services (DIS) provides support for all computer operations of the Food Stamp Program.

Nevada's 14 local offices serve a mixture of urban and rural areas. The largest urban areas include Las Vegas, Reno and Carson City. The state contains large Indian Reservations and rural areas in which communications and transportation are difficult.

The latest population count, as furnished by the State, placed the population at 1,388,630. Approximately 5.7% (79,740) are Food Stamp recipients.

State employment levels (industrial based employment, i.e., non-agricultural) increased by 1.3% from 1990 to 1991 and by 1.9% from 1991 to 1992. The first two quarters of 1993 show another 3.9% increase.

The overall unemployment rates fell from 1987 (6.3%) through 1990 (4.9%) but increased to 5.5% in 1991 and 6.6% in 1992.

Information published by the National Association of State Budget Officers in October, 1992 indicates:

- Nevada's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal 1993 is in the 0 - 5% range which is close to the national average for all states (except California) of 3.6%.
- \$52 million was cut from the approved 1992 State Budget.
- State employment levels increased 4.62% over 1992, while the national average change was a drop of .6%.
- No changes were implemented by Nevada to increase or decrease revenue.

## **2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS**

Recent large increases in population were cited by state staff as contributing to the rise in

Food Stamp eligible households. Nevada's geographic features were not cited as a major concern to the operation of the Food Stamp Program, but communications and transportation are obvious problems in some regions. Nevada does operate an extensive

itinerant services program designed to reach potential clients who may not be otherwise served due to lack of transportation and the remote nature of certain areas of the State.

## 2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

Food Stamp households increased from 16,876 in 1988 to 36,332 in 1992. The number of individuals receiving Food Stamps showed an increase from 36,601 to 79,740 during the same period. These increases of 115% and 118%, respectively, show Nevada to be experiencing a large growth in this public assistance area.

Growth in eligible Food Stamp households appears to have increased significantly from 1990 to 1992, as shown in Table 2.1 below:

**Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation**

Program	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC - cases	11,496	9,108	8,003	7,001	5,995
AFDC-individuals	31,286	25,143	22,133	19,359	16,708
FSP-households	36,332	27,827	22,423	18,983	16,876
FSP-individuals	79,740	63,078	49,815	41,330	36,601
Medicaid-individuals	62,411	48,378	39,822	33,177	29,032
GA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Child Welfare	1,931	1,811	1,706	1,685	1,552

## 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs \*

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 9:1 in 1987 to 15:1 in 1991.

Nevada's average monthly benefit issued per household during the past five years is depicted in Table 2.2 below:

\* Note: Data gathered from State Activity Reports



**Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued**

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	\$170.38	\$167.64	\$152.33	\$134.93	\$127.52

**2.3 FSP Administrative Costs \***

Nevada's Food Stamp Program Administrative Costs (Table 2.3) for the past five years were:

**Table 2.3 FSP Administrative Costs**

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	\$5,146,615	\$3,802,726	\$3,465,837	\$3,210,347	\$3,106,903
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	\$11.80	\$13.55	\$12.88	\$14.08	\$15.34

**2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance****2.4.1 Staffing**

Currently, the eligibility worker and supervisor staff numbers 126. Other users of the system include clerical and administrative staff and systems support and development personnel. Since NOMADS has not yet been developed, there is no significant staffing impact from the new system.

**2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes**

As shown in Appendix A, Exhibit 2-1, Nevada claims to have met the timeliness requirements for implementation of all major legislative changes in the Food Stamp Program areas which they cited were applicable to their specific environment. It appears that Nevada's issuance schedule, in which benefit determination and/or redetermination and benefit recalculations are spread over the entire month, impacts the method by which "mass changes" are performed. Changes to policies which impact benefits and eligibility are run as part of the daily schedule, as opposed to being run against all cases at a single time. The impact of this "cycle" operation on

\* Note: As gathered from the State Activity Report

issuance and benefit calculation policies tends to negate the implementation timeliness; however, there were no indications that this causes any problems with Nevada Food Stamp clients.

#### 2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate \*

Nevada's Official Combined Error Rate, Table 2.4 below, steadily increased from 1987 through 1990, but was still well below the average for the national average of 9.81 for FY 90.

**Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate**

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	11.20	7.78	6.49	4.82	2.69

#### 2.4.4 Claims Collection \*

Nevada's claims collected has increased each year except 1990. The percent collected of the total claims established has increased steadily for all five years.

**Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected**

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	\$359,585	\$254,958	\$257,979	\$464,940	\$560,269
Total Claims Collected	\$196,328	\$195,662	\$169,371	\$199,206	\$156,930
As a % of Total Claims Established	54.5%	76.7%	65.7%	42.9%	28.1%

#### 2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

Nevada's current Food Stamp system became fully operational in 1978 and has been approved, according to State staff. The date of the approval was not known.

### 3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE CURRENT SYSTEM

The current Food Stamp system does not support any other program area. NOMADS, which is currently in the General System Design phase, is intended to support Food Stamps,

\* Note: As gathered from the State Activity Report

AFDC and Child Support. The Eligibility and Payment System (AFDC) also supports the Medicaid eligibility program area. A separate Medicaid system is maintained for claims and payments. The Child Welfare System handles the Child Welfare Case Management, IV-E and Child Welfare-related Medicaid. NOMADS is expected to be a fully-functional,

FAMIS system that supports all eligibility requirements, with the exception of Child Welfare. NOMADS will also support Child Support Enforcement.

### **3.1 Current System Functionality**

The current Food Stamp System has been in existence for almost fifteen years. Modifications and enhancements have been made to the system over the years, moving it from a paper-driven batch mode to a moderate degree of on-line functionality.

In the current Food Stamp System, terminals are used to enter some applicant information for clearance purposes. This clearance determines if the Head of Household is currently, or has been previously, active in either the AFDC or Food Stamp Programs. This search is conducted only at the point of eligibility determination. The system does have the ability to copy historical records into the current applicant file, eliminating the need to re-enter static information. Application data is entered into the system by clerical employees who are required to review potential matches.

The system has the ability to search participant files on the basis of name (including partial names) and SSN. This search MAY be conducted for any member of the household; however, only the Head of Household for current and previous cases MUST be searched against.

There is only one (1) data entry screen in the current system.

There is no automated follow-up or tracking of missing verifications. The Eligibility Certification Specialist (ECS) makes an off-line decision to prevent eligibility determination if verifications are not received.

System-supported eligibility determination is limited to income only. Calculation of benefit level is performed by the system, but requires verification by the Eligibility Worker (EW) on the same day.

Nevada contracts with a private firm for mail issuance. The system transmits issuance data electronically to the contractor. Approximately 20% of issuance is direct access and 80% is mailout. Expedited issuance is possible on a next-day basis.

The system generates a variety of notices to the client. Notices are printed at the District Offices and EW's have the ability to add written comments to these documents. All notices must be requested by the worker, with the exception of mass change notifications.

The existing claims sub-system is integrated into the Food Stamp System. It is a batch-oriented system with the EW entering information via a paper claim form. This system tracks the claim status, calculates the recoupment amount, subtracts this amount from the monthly benefit and creates a collection record. No claims notices to the clients are automatically generated by the system.

The collection method is determined by the EW and the establishment of a claim must be approved by a supervisor.

Computer matching is basically performed in a batch mode monthly or quarterly. Wage and unemployment (State) data can be accessed on-line, with the results returned overnight. There is no automatic interface with DMV records, but there is computer access to DMV records upon request. Duplicate participation checks are performed only at eligibility determination. Recertification checks are not supported. Discrepancies are reported in the form of printed reports routed to the assigned worker. Tracking of match resolutions is manually performed.

The current system maintains "interfaces" with both the claims and issuance sub-systems. Other interfaces exist for matching purposes, but these "interfaces" consist of little more than the batch matching of limited demographic information and/or the ability to directly access search routines from Food Stamp terminals.

### **3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity**

Since the current system was designed in the early 1970s, the degree of complexity and integration is relatively low. The Food Stamp function is standalone, as are most of the other public assistance functions.

### **3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio**

The current system is paper-oriented with data entry operators performing most computer-related functions. The ratio of terminals to eligibility workers is, approximately, 6 to 1. The planned ratio for NOMADS is 1 to 1.

### **3.4 Current Automation Issues**

NOMADS's current status of general system design precludes a comprehensive inventory of automation problems. Areas of concern mentioned by state staff include: IV-D inclusion, contractor misunderstanding of the "cycle" concept where Nevada issues throughout the month and not just in 10 or 13 day cycles, difficulties in defining sub-system interface requirements and the need for development of additional functionality and edits before implementation. In addition, the change to interactive interviewing and the integration of eligibility determination functions at the worker level will entail training and organizational changes that could pose implementation difficulties. IV-D inclusion for Nevada will entail the involvement of various District Attorney's offices across the state. These offices currently maintain individual work processes and have no formal organizational ties to the

Department. Additional efforts will be required to consolidate their work functions into NOMADS.

ISSC, the implementation contractor, and various sub-contractors involved in the design and implementation of the system, have little experience in Nevada's unique "cycle" approach (issuance spread over the entire month, instead of a shorter 10 day cycle) and the user's have spent considerable time briefing them on the concept and potential impact of this approach on system functionality.

No specific information was available for the expected operating capabilities and characteristics of NOMADS since the implementation phase of the project is just getting underway and design specifications are not completed.

#### **4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION**

##### **4.1 Overview of the Previous System**

Since the NOMADS system is entering the Implementation RFP stage, the description of the previous system refers to the current operational system described earlier in section 3.1.

##### **4.2 Justification for the New System (NOMADS)**

The basic reasons for implementing the NOMADS system are:

- Cost savings of approximately \$17 million over the next eight fiscal years in the Food Stamp area;
- automated client follow-up process;
- automated recalculations of eligibility for past periods;
- improved IEVS processing;
- reduced errors;
- integrated public assistance programs;
- improved client services; and
- more efficient utilization of State staff and resources.

##### **4.3 Planning and Development Activities**

In 1987 - 1988 Nevada staff visited several states to review systems for possible transfer. A PAPD was submitted in 1988 and approved in 1989, along with an approved planning contractor RFP. The IAPD was submitted in September, 1991,

and approved December, 1992. In the meantime, the implementation contractor RFP was approved in February, 1992. System implementation is scheduled to be completed by May, 1995. The Food Stamp program will be supported by the current system until that time.

The InRhodes system was proposed as the transfer system by the Integrated System Solutions Corporation (ISSC), the successful bidder. The proposed system, with AFDC, Medicaid, Food Stamps, Child Support and local program integration is viewed as among the most complex systems currently being implemented in the nation. These modifications will include the development of interfaces to the existing Claims Collection and Issuance sub-systems for Food Stamps. Additional functionality and edit criteria have also been identified by Nevada as being necessary modifications to the transferred system.

It was understood by the State, prior to transfer selection, that the InRhodes System lacked the exact report formats needed in Nevada, and that the database change from ADABAS to DB2 would have to be made. It is reasonable to assume that more changes will be identified as the project matures.

#### **4.4 Conversion Approach**

At the current stage of the project, the conversion approach has not been determined.

#### **4.5 Project Management**

Nevada has completed the Planning Phase of the NOMADS project and has just begun the Implementation Phase. The Implementation RFP was awarded to ISSC in June, 1992.

The Planning Phase organization included a Project Manager, Kathie Whyte, from a program background, and active participation from all areas of the public assistance staff and in-house MIS.\*

#### **4.6 FSP Participation**

Members from all pertinent public assistance programs played a role during the Planning Phase and will continue to participate as part of one of several of the following NOMADS project groups or committees:

- assignment to the NOMADS team as a permanent or temporary member to support any aspect of the implementation, testing or conversion tasks;
- member of the Steering Committee to guide and advise the NOMADS Project Manager in the direction and conduct of the project;

\* After the date of the site visit, Ms. Whyte resigned and was replaced by Mr. Sarsfield.

- member of the Advisory Committee which consists of senior management who will oversee the impact/direction of NOMADS project decisions.

#### 4.7 MIS Participation

Internal state MIS staff have been assigned to the NOMADS team for the duration

## **6.0 SYSTEMS OPERATIONS**

### **6.1 System Profile**

The components supporting the current Food Stamp system in Nevada are as follows (a detailed listing is contained in the appendix, Exhibit 6-1):

- **Mainframe:** IBM ES 9000 - 500  
MVS/ESA, CICS, ADABAS, RACF
- **Disk:** IBM 3380/3390
- **Tape:** IBM 3420 Reel  
IBM 3480 Cartridge
- **Printers:** IBM 3835 Laser  
IBM 4248 Impact
- **Front Ends:** IBM 3745  
IBM 3725
- **Workstations:** Variety of 3270-type terminals
- **Telecommunications:** 100 - 9.6 KB SNA circuits connected to Carson City; T1 link between Carson City and Las Vegas



## **6.2 Description of Operating Environment**

### **6.2.1 Operating Environment**

The Nevada Department of Data Processing (DDP) runs the data center processing the State's automated workload. The center is staffed by 14 personnel and operates the IBM 9000 - Model 500 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. The CPU runs both production and test workloads in a partitioned environment. Production is allocated 90% of memory (128 megabytes) and 88% of the channels (28). The system runs under MVS/ESA and CICS. The current database system is ADABAS, but DB2 is the choice for all new database development, including NOMADS.

Both 3380 (single, double and triple density drives) and 3390 disks are used as auxiliary storage.

Tape processing has been migrated to 3480 tape cartridge drives with a nominal number of 3420 reel-to-reel drives retained for support of external user and archive tapes. The tape library consists of 28,500 tapes, including 2,500 reels.

Front end processors, 1 - 3745 and 1 - 3725, support all telecommunications circuits under SNA NCP and VTAM. Netview is used to monitor the network.

An uninterruptible power supply (UPS) system is in place with both battery and diesel generator support installed.

### **6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance**

The Department of Data Processing (DDP) provides the operations and programming support for the Food Stamp system. Application support is provided by the Systems and Programming Division of DDP, while operations support is provided by the Facilities Management Division. A data development group within the NOMADS project team is also providing application insights to the planning and support effort.

Hardware and software maintenance on system components and software is performed on Sundays. Application changes are implemented at any time it is felt that the change will not adversely affect the production systems.

### **6.2.3 Telecommunications**

The Nevada telecommunications network is a shared (backbone) group of 100 multi-dropped circuits that tie all locations and applications into the Carson City data center. The circuits are normally 9.6 KB, but some can be up to 19.2 KB, based on the circuit transaction volume. All circuits are SNA and are controlled by the 3745/3725 NCP front end complex. Due to volume and the number of users in the vicinity, Las Vegas is connected to Carson City with a T1 link. There are plans to add more and faster lines, up to 56 KB, to accommodate the NOMADS application.

Due to a proposed reorganization of the Nevada State government, all of the telecommunications support functions will be grouped within a single entity, the Facility Management Division, of the Information Services Department. This will afford the State a chance to identify and correct all network performance deficiencies and plan corrective actions.

#### **6.2.4 System Performance**

The 44 MIP ES9000 Model 500 is running at 45-50% of capacity, on average, with first shift peaks of 70%. There are no apparent capacity problems on the mainframe and there is a reasonable amount of processor growth to accommodate all state applications for the foreseeable future. Batch cycles are processed from 6 p.m. to 4 a.m. and do not create problems for the online being brought up on time in the morning. Disk and tape resources are adequate and provide a good mix of current technology for performance (3390 and 3480), and older technology (3380 and 3420) for cost effectiveness. ESCON (IBM fiber optic) channels are incorporated into the 9000/500, but no I/O has yet been connected to this new technology. Future requirements for higher channel throughput will be able to use this higher speed alternative for new tape and DASD products, without the need for hardware upgrades. Floor space is available for hardware growth and the UPS system provides excellent insurance against extended power outages.

#### **6.2.5 System Response**

No response timings are maintained by Nevada to determine performance at the terminal; however, both data center staff/application support, and Food Stamp Program staff indicated some major problems with response time tied to the current telecommunications network. NOMADS implementation will bring increased telecommunications resources, more lines, and higher speed lines. In the interim, additional lines are being installed as budget and resource restraints permit.

#### **6.2.6 System Downtime**

System outages are rather infrequent, but they do occur. No specific problem areas were identified. Some outages are directly connected to the telecommunications network, but no abnormal situations appear to exist. Hardware and software performance in the data center are at 99+ %.

#### **6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans**

There are active plans to increase CPU memory size and add more DASD. NOMADS is in general design and target implementation is 1995.

## 7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses the following topics:

- NOMADS planning and estimated development costs
- Current Nevada Food Stamps System operating costs
- Cost allocation methodology applied to NOMADS planning and development cost and current Food Stamp system operating costs.

### 7.1 Nevada FAMIS Development Costs and Federal Funding

In June, 1990, the total cost of NOMADS was projected to be \$20.9 million with the FNS share at \$4.8 million (23%).

By June, 1992, the projected cost had grown to \$31.7 million with the FNS share at \$5.98 million (18.9%). The total amount of FNS reimbursement (FFP) was to be \$4 million: \$1.6 million at 75% FFP, and \$2.4 million at 63% FFP.

When the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) portion of NOMADS was dropped, however, the projected total cost of NOMADS development was reduced to \$22 million, with an FNS share of \$6.3 million. Appendix A, Exhibit 7-1, NOMADS Budget FY93 - FY95<sup>1</sup>, provides a detailed budget by category for NOMADS and the Food Stamp Program share of NOMADS. Table 7.1, Current NOMADS Budget, shows costs for both development and implementation.<sup>2</sup>

In regard to FNS, it shows that:

- FNS has been allocated 28% of all development costs and almost 33% of all implementation costs.
- FNS FFP for development averages over 67%; FNS FFP for implementation will be reimbursed at 63%.

In January, 1993, FNS granted approval of enhanced funding for all FFY92 costs and up to \$839,484 of FFY93 expenditures. For the remaining budgeted costs for FFY93 (\$531,286), and FFY94/FFY95, expenditures will be reimbursed at a 63% enhanced rate.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Numbers are extracted from the 9/92 budget submitted to FNS with the APD.

<sup>2</sup>Budgeted costs were extracted from correspondence dated 1/8/93. Exhibit 7.1 (from 9/29 APD) shows the Food Stamp share to be \$5,984,116,\$361,219 less than Table 7.1. The reason for this discrepancy cannot be determined from the information available.

<sup>3</sup>Letter, 1/13/93.

Table 7.1 CURRENT NOMADS BUDGET<sup>4</sup>

BUDGET GROUP	DEVELOPMENT 10/1/92 - 12/31/94		IMPLEMENTATION 1/1/95 - 6/30/95		TOTAL	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
FNS STATE	\$1,714,174	32.35	\$386,943	37	\$2,101,117	33.11
FNS FEDERAL	\$3,585,368	67.65	\$658,850	63	\$4,244,218	66.89
FNS TOTAL	\$5,299,542	28.05	\$1,045,793	32.96	\$6,345,335	28.76
NON-FNS STATE	\$2,589,028	19.05	\$386,044	18.15	\$2,975,072	18.93
NON-FNS FEDERAL	\$11,002,763	80.95	\$1,741,231	81.85	\$12,743,994	81.07
TOTAL NON-FNS	\$13,591,791	71.95	\$2,127,275	67.04	\$15,719,066	71.24
TOTAL	\$18,891,333	85.62	\$3,173,068	14.38	\$22,064,401	

<sup>4</sup>As of 1/8/93.

### **7.1.1 Nevada FAMIS System Components**

NOMADS is an umbrella project to develop and implement statewide automated systems including:

- Family Assistance Management Information System
- Food Stamps System
- Medicaid Eligibility System
- Child Support Enforcement System
- Child Care, JOBS and Training

Each of these systems is to share a common data base. Initially, NOMADS was to support a Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS), but the requirement was dropped in 1992.

### **7.1.2 Major Nevada FAMIS Development Cost Components**

This section provides both projected and actual costs to date for major cost components of the NOMADS project. The projected costs were extracted from correspondence between the FNS Oversight Committee, the FNS Regional Office and the State of Nevada, the current IAPD, and the Cost Allocation Survey completed by Nevada project personnel in March, 1993. Actual costs were provided by State personnel during the on-site visit.

#### **7.1.2.1 NOMADS Planning Costs**

NOMADS projected planning costs of \$733,600 were approved in July, 1990. The FNS share of these costs was \$146,720, with an FNS FFP of \$110,040, at 75%. As of March, 1993, NOMADS planning efforts totalled \$534,439, with the FNS share at \$148,620.

#### **7.1.2.2 Hardware and Software**

Additional personal computers and network hardware are required to support the NOMADS development effort. The cost of this hardware is estimated to be \$576,274. The FNS share of this is estimated to be \$129,085 (22.4%).

Additional software will be required for NOMADS, including DB2 and supporting utilities. The monthly leasing cost for the software will be \$3,322 with the FNS share at \$864 (26%).

### 7.1.2.3 Contractor Costs

The state of Nevada contracted with three companies to support NOMAD activities:

- **Ernst & Young** was contracted to complete the Implementation APD (IAPD) and the RFP to procure contractor support to transfer, develop and implement the NOMADS.
- **Integrated Systems Solution Corporation (ISSC)** was awarded the implementation contract to transfer, develop and implement NOMADS. The contract was awarded in August 1992, for \$12,318,994. The contract period of performance is 45 months. As of March, 1993, the implementation contractor had expended over \$1.09 million. The FNS share was \$291,505<sup>5</sup>.
- **Systemhouse, Inc.** was awarded a contract to provide support services to Nevada during the NOMADS development effort. The contract was awarded in October, 1992, for \$824,826. An additional \$90,000 for 1000 hours of system changes was not included in the contract. The contract period of performance is 32 months, from 12/1/92 through 7/31/95.

### 7.1.2.4 State Personnel Costs

Twenty-four Nevada personnel are budgeted for NOMADS<sup>6</sup> development work, with 17 of these being field staff. Table 7.2, Projected State Personnel, presents the projected State personnel costs through FY96 of \$3.3 million, with an FNS share of \$.67 million.

**Table 7.2. Projected State Personnel**

FISCAL YEAR	PERSONNEL COSTS \$	FNS SHARE \$	FNS SHARE %
93	934,850	190,993	20.43
94	874,095	163,993	18.76
95	878,488	164,822	18.76
96	617,530	150,990	24.45
TOTAL	\$3,304,963	\$670,798	20.30%

<sup>5</sup>Allocated at 26.6%.

<sup>6</sup>APD, December 1992.

State personnel costs for NOMADS planning activities performed through October, 1992 were not available. The \$534,439 planning costs include all costs expended for the planning phase of NOMADS.

## 7.2 Nevada Operational Costs

The operating costs recorded for the current system which supports the Food Stamp Program are provided in Table 7.3, Current Food Stamp System Operating Costs.

**Table 7.3. Current Food Stamp System Operating Costs**

	1992	1991	1990
<b>Monthly Operating Costs (Annual/12)</b>	\$19,666 <sup>7</sup>	\$27,809	\$26,447
<b>Monthly Caseload</b>	\$36,332	\$27,827	\$22,423
<b>Cost Per Case</b>	\$0.54 *	\$1.00	\$1.18

### 7.2.1 ADP Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The Food Stamp System is run in a State data center operated by the Department of Data Processing (DDP). The DDP bills the Nevada Welfare Division and all other State agencies monthly, for services rendered. The billing details the direct charges accumulated for the Food Stamp System, including batch processing, CICS usage, and any adjustments to CICS administration. The billing provides the total cost of all application programmers and analysts who have direct charged their time to specific programs. The billing also provides a total for teleprocessing costs, which is also direct charged.

DDP allocates 29% to the Welfare Division of the following data center costs: DASD usage, unit record (card and paper handling), ADABAS, and data control. The costs for all support personnel are allocated to the Welfare Division at 29%, as are all other costs not charged directly to a program.<sup>8</sup>

\* Note: Preliminary cost figures; likely to be higher when all costs are calculated.

<sup>7</sup>Computer services billing methodology for the Facilities Management Division was modified in 1992. The billing will be corrected in FY94.

<sup>8</sup>The 29% allocation to the Welfare Division has been an accepted practice for a number of years.

The 29% DPP allocation, currently assigned to the Welfare Division, is expected to increase when NOMADS is implemented.

### 7.3 Nevada Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses:

- The cost allocation methodology used by Nevada to allocate development costs to the programs to be supported by NOMADS.
- The methodology used to allocate the 29% share of DDP operating costs currently charged to the Welfare Division.

#### 7.3.1 Overview of NOMADS Development Cost Allocation Methodology

NOMADS will support seven welfare programs. When a cost can be identified directly with one of the seven programs, that cost will be charged directly to that program. If a cost can be tracked to two or more programs, it is allocated based on the percentages documented in Table 7-4, NOMADS Allocation Percentages. This table shows the percentage allocation of a cost to each of the seven programs. The Child Support Enforcement (CSE) System has been allocated at 43%. The remaining 57% will be allocated among the other six programs including the Food Stamp Program.

**Table 7.4. NOMADS Allocation Percentages<sup>9</sup>**

NOMADS PROGRAM	COST ALLOCATION %	ALLOCATION OF 57% NON-CSE COSTS
Child Support Enforcement	43	-
Food Stamps	24	41.86
ADC	19	34.88
Child Care	2	2.33
Medicaid Eligibility	5	9.3
JOBS	5	9.3
Training	2	2.33
	100%	100%

<sup>9</sup>The allocation percentages are based on cost allocation task loaded staffing schedule.



### 7.3.2 Nevada Operational Cost Allocation Methodology & Mechanics

The Welfare Division allocates the 29% share of DDP costs to welfare programs based on the direct costs accumulated by DDP for each program using the following formula:

$$\% \text{ ALLOCATION}_{\text{WELFARE PGM}} = \frac{\text{DIRECT COSTS}_{\text{WELFARE PGM}}}{\text{TOTAL DIRECT COSTS}_{\text{ALL WELFARE PGMS}}}$$

According to the current Cost Allocation Plan, this methodology, allocating DDP indirect costs to a welfare program based on DDP direct costs accumulated for that program, will be applied to NOMADS ongoing operations.

**APPENDIX A**

**STATE OF NEVADA**

**EXHIBITS**

**Exhibit 2-1  
Response to Regulatory Changes**

Code	Regulation	Provision	Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to HHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	Y
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	N/A NO PROGRAM	WHICH PROVIDES PAYMENTS	
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	10/1/91	Y	N	Y
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	12/4/91	Y	N	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	N	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal timeframes. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N/A Fiscal month issuance precludes proration		

**Exhibit 2-1 (continued)**  
**Response to Regulatory Changes**

Code	Regulation	Provision	Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service timeframes. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N/A		
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	Y
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/88	Y	N	Y
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	N	Y
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	?	N/A		
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	N/A		
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	N	Y
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	Y

**Exhibit 6-1**  
**STATE OF NEVADA**  
**HARDWARE INVENTORY**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Make</b>	<b>Acquisition Method</b>	<b>Number/ Features</b>
<b>CPU</b>			
ES9000-500	IBM	Purchase	32 channels, 148 MB main storage, 256 MB extended storage, PR/SM, 44 MIPS
<b>DISK</b>			
3380/3390	IBM	Purchase	Controllers: 3990 (4) 3880 (5) Drives: 3390 (8) 3380 (21)
<b>TAPE</b>			
Reel Tape Drives	IBM	Purchase	3420 (4)
Cartridge Drives	IBM	Purchase	3480 (20)
<b>PRINTERS</b>			
Laser	IBM	Purchase	3835
Impact	IBM	Purchase	4248
<b>FRONT ENDS</b>			
37XX	IBM	Purchase	3745 (1) 3725 (1)
<b>REMOTE EQUIPMENT</b>			
3270 Type	Various	Purchase	200 (est.)

**Exhibit 7-1 NOMADS Budget FY93 - FY95 by Budget Category**

BUDGET CATEGORY	(a) TOTAL NOMADS \$	(b) % TOTAL NOMADS COST	(c) FOOD STAMPS \$	(d) % TOTAL FOODS STAMP	(e) FOOD STAMPS % OF NOMADS	BUDGET CATEGORY ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY
Welfare Division Staff	2,368,771	10.74	434,260	7.26	18.33	One senior management analyst, one program specialist, and one programmer analyst are assigned specifically to Title IV-D; all other personnel are allocated among all NOMADS-supported programs.
DDP Staff	579,668	2.63	121,275	2.03	20.92	One programmer/Analyst is assigned to the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) Program; all others are allocated among all programs. Includes one data base analyst and partial use of a full time Systems Programmer allocated among all programs.
ISSC	11,181,327	50.68	3,110,067	51.97	27.81	All deliverables will be presented with an invoice which provides appropriate percentages based on the contractor's ability to provide information regarding the amount of time or cost which was attributed to a certain cost center. Those percentages of the bill which cannot be directly allocated will be cost allocated across all programs.
Systemhouse	824,821	3.74	230,951	3.86	28.00	
Hardware/System Software	1,724,967	7.82	530,337	8.86	30.74	Actual invoices will be direct charged where possible; other costs are allocated across all programs.
DDP Operations	4,749,325	21.52	1,398,759	23.37	29.45	Allocated based on the percentage of the facility's costs that the Welfare Division is expecting to carry when the transfer system is implemented.
Rent/Util/Supplies	125,153	0.57	34,045	0.57	27.20	Allocated among all programs.
Electrical Upgrades	238,500	1.08	56,000	0.94	23.48	Allocated among all programs.
Travel	240,670	1.09	60,081	1.00	24.96	Direct charged where possible; allocated otherwise.
Training	31,199	0.14	8,341	0.14	26.73	Direct charged where possible; allocated otherwise.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22,064,401</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>5,984,116</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27.73</b>	

column b = column a + Total column a  
column d = column c + Total column c  
column e = column c + Total column a

APPENDIX B

STATE OF NEVADA

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

## OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility workers in Nevada. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Nevada. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers perception about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

### Description of the Sample

The survey was sent to 63 eligibility workers. The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Mississippi	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
109	63	58.3%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	34	54.1%

The response rate of 53 percent is acceptable and produced a sample large enough for the results to be representative of those selected, rather than the opinions of just a few individuals. The eligibility workers selected to receive the were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Nevada.

### Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents were satisfied with the computer system in Mississippi. They generally found it responsive, accurate, and easy to use. Two complaints were that peak response time was inadequate and that systems data was sometimes out-of-date.

Similarly, most of the respondents thought the computer system helped them do their jobs and made them more efficient.



## SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

### Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	5	14.7
Good	26	76.5
Excellent	3	8.8

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	20	58.8
Good	13	38.2
Excellent	1	2.9

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	1	2.9
Sometimes	24	70.6
Often	9	26.5

More than three quarters of the eligibility workers think the system response time is generally good but a significant proportion (59 percent) indicate that peak response time is poor and even more that response time is often too slow.

## Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	1	2.9
Sometimes	9	26.5
Often	24	70.6

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	15	44.1
Sometimes	19	55.9

The eligibility workers feel the system is available when they need to use it. Although more than half also think the system is sometimes down, this does not detract from the perception that the system is generally available.

## Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	3	8.8
Good	28	82.4
Excellent	3	8.8

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	29	85.3
Sometimes	5	14.7

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	81.8
Sometimes	6	18.2

How often is the system data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	61.8
Sometimes	11	32.4
Often	2	5.9

The eligibility workers generally think the system's data and computations are quite accurate. Although most feel that cases are rarely terminated in error, a significant proportion feel that the data available for matching is sometimes out-of-date.

#### **Ease of Use**

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	52.9
Sometimes	14	41.2
Often	2	5.9

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	79.4
Sometimes	7	20.6

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	9	75.0
Sometimes	2	16.7
Often	1	8.3

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	13	92.9
Sometimes	1	7.1

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	24	92.3
Sometimes	2	7.7

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	16	80.0
Sometimes	4	20.0

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	90.0
Often	1	10.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	94.1
Sometimes	2	5.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	22	64.7
Sometimes	9	26.5
Often	3	8.8

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	92.6
Sometimes	2	7.4

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	32	94.1
Sometimes	1	2.9
Often	1	2.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	81.5
Sometimes	4	14.8
Often	1	3.7

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	7	50.0
Sometimes	3	21.4
Often	4	28.6

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	11	57.9
Sometimes	6	31.6
Often	2	10.5

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	83.3
Sometimes	5	16.7

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	82.1
Sometimes	5	17.9

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Not Applicable	1	4.2
Rarely	17	70.8
Sometimes	4	16.7
Often	2	8.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	47.6
Sometimes	6	28.6
Often	5	23.8

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	10	43.5
Sometimes	6	26.1
Often	7	30.4

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	88.5
Sometimes	2	7.7
Often	1	3.8

The eligibility workers generally feel that the system is easy to use. They report rarely having difficulty performing most of their usual functions. Almost half, however, indicated some difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system. There was also a significant percentage, over 50 percent, who felt that error prone cases and suspected fraud were difficult to identify.

## **FSP NEEDS**

### **Worker Satisfaction Levels**

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	1	2.9
Sometimes	4	11.8
Often	29	85.3



How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	18	52.9
Sometimes	15	44.1
Often	1	2.9

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	76.5
Sometimes	8	23.5

The eligibility workers are generally satisfied with the system although a significant percentage (47 percent) find that it adds stress to their work.

#### **Client Service**

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	79.4
Sometimes	7	20.6

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	83.9
Sometimes	5	16.1

Most eligibility workers agreed that expedited service was rarely difficult to provide. Because Nevada's system was implemented over five years ago, the questions in this section comparing the current system to the previous system were not applicable.

**Fraud and Errors**

Because Nevada's system was implemented more than five years ago, this section comparing the current system to the previous system was not applicable.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF NEVADA

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

## OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of supervisors in Nevada. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Nevada. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers perception about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

### Description of the Sample

The survey was sent to 30 local office supervisors. The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of Supervisors in Nevada	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
16	16	100%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	12	75%

Since there are so few supervisors in Nevada, all were selected to receive a survey; the response of those responding should be representative of all supervisors in Nevada.

### Summary of Findings

Most of the supervisors think the system is very good and helps them in their jobs. They report that their own personal job satisfaction and efficiency has increased, and that their ability to carry out their management tasks also has increased. Almost all respondents found the system easy to learn and use and agreed that it was a better system than the previous one. A significant subset, however, felt that the system added stress to their jobs. The number of respondents to some questions was low, producing a small and possibly unrepresentative sample.

## SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

### Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	33.3
Good	8	66.7

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	11	91.7
Good	1	8.3

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	7	58.3
Often	5	41.7

Although the supervisors who responded think the system's response time is generally good, almost all feel that peak response time is poor and a majority think that response time is often too slow.

### Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	8.3
Often	11	91.7

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	25.0
Sometimes	8	66.7
Often	1	8.3

The supervisors who responded feel that the system is generally available, with only one thinking that it is down often.

### Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	8.3
Good	10	83.3
Excellent	1	8.3

Most of the supervisors who responded feel that it is easier to calculate benefits more accurately and most (92 percent) think the information in the system is good or excellent.

### Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	50.0
Sometimes	5	41.7
Often	1	8.3

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	66.7
Sometimes	4	33.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	75.0
Sometimes	1	25.0

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	83.3
Sometimes	1	16.7

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	72.7
Sometimes	3	27.3

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	4	66.7
Sometimes	2	33.3

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	75.0
Sometimes	1	25.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	70.0
Sometimes	3	30.0

Almost all the responding supervisors think that system is easy to use and most rarely have difficulty performing any of the various functions. One third reported having difficulty learning the system. The number of respondents to some of these particular questions is low, producing a small and possibly unrepresentative sample.



## **FSP NEEDS**

### **Supervisor Satisfaction Levels**

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	8.3
Sometimes	3	25.0
Often	8	66.7

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	66.7
Sometimes	3	25.0
Often	1	8.3

Most of the supervisors who responded think that the system is helpful and does not add stress to the job.

### **Management Needs**

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	11	100.0

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	25.0
Good	5	41.7
Excellent	4	33.3

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	14.3
Sometimes	4	57.1
Often	2	28.6

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	60.0
Sometimes	2	40.0

Most of the supervisors responding think the system helps them in their some of their management tasks, with 100 percent thinking that the reports produced by the system are good. Almost everyone agrees that the support provided by the technical staff is good or excellent, but a large majority, 85 percent, feel that they sometimes or often have difficulty implementing mass changes. The number of respondents to some of these particular questions is low, producing a small and possibly unrepresentative sample.

**Client Service**

Because Nevada's system was implemented more than five years ago, this section comparing the current system to the previous system was not applicable.

**Fraud and Errors**

Because Nevada's system was implemented more than five years ago, this section comparing the current system to the previous system was not applicable.